REMARKS

Claims 13-19, 21 and 23-37 are now in this application.

By this amendment claim 20 has been canceled and new claim 37 added.

Claim 37 is similar to claims 13-24, although it better defines the invention over the prior art by more specifically reciting and specifying that the improvement is in the environment of a differential pressure chamber of a pressure amplifier, and that the recited structure is an improvement to a differential pressure chamber of a pressure amplifier.

It is noted that in paragraph 2, which starts on page 2 of the action, the examiner has rejected claims 13, 14, 23-27, and 29-36. In paragraph 6, which starts on page 7 of the action, the examiner has rejected claims 15-20, 27 and 28.

Claim 21 does not appear in either of these lists, and thus apparently has not been rejected in the Office action. If this is what the examiner intended, the implied allowability of claim 21 is gratefully acknowledged.

In the Office action the examiner rejected claims 13, 14, 23-27 and 29-36 as anticipated by Bessiere. However, it is pointed out that Bessiere does not teach the structure as recited in claim 13. In particular, Bessiere does not teach a differential pressure chamber which controls a pressure amplifier, which is clearly recited in claim 13.

And further, without teaching a differential pressure chamber, Bessiere cannot possibly include any teaching of a bore which connects the differential pressure chamber to a control valve which actuates the pressure amplifier.

Accordingly, the rejection of claim 13 under 35 USC 102 clearly is not proper, because the reference to Bessiere does not teach all of the structure which is recited in claim 13.

As the examiner is probably aware, a differential pressure chamber, such as recited in claim 13, is part of a pressure amplifier. Bessiere does not in any way teach such a pressure amplifier, and certainly does not teach a differential pressure chamber.

And further, this claim goes on to recite that the control line leads to a valve that actuates the pressure amplifier by subjecting the differential pressure chamber to pressure or relieves it from such pressure. Clearly again, Bessiere does not include any such structure, so it was clearly not proper for the examiner to reject claim 13 under 35 USC 102.

The examiner has argued that claim 13, as written, states "**the intersection** of a differential pressure chamber (6), **controlling a pressure amplifier** (throttle valve 12, col 2, Lines 42-62), and a control line (11) in the form of a bore (opening 6a connected to 23 and 11) that subjects the differential pressure chamber (6) to pressure," or stated in another way, **the intersection controlling a pressure amplifier**, because subordinate clauses, "of a differential pressure chamber" and participial phrase "controlling a pressure amplifier" are used as modifiers for the noun "**the intersection**".

In the examiner's statement, as quoted above, it is assumed that the characters within parenthesis are referring to structure within the reference to Bessiere. Whatever the case on this assumption, it seems that the examiner has somehow come up with an erroneous interpretation of the claim language. First it is pointed out that the phrase "controlling a pressure amplifier" could easily have been left out of the claim, in which case the claim clearly reads that the connection point is the intersection of the differential pressure chamber and the bore. And since Bessiere does not have a differential pressure chamber, Bessiere cannot have such an intersection.

And moreover, the phrase "controlling the pressure amplifier" merely modifies the differential pressure chamber, effectively putting a limitation that the differential pressure chamber is part of a pressure amplifier. This phrase does not in any way change that the connection point is the intersection of the differential pressure chamber and the bore.

In Bessiere, a gear pump 17 pumps engine oil to adjust piston 12 and thus restriction 14, depending on the engine speed. This controls how fast piston 5 can move, and this in turn controls the rate at which the fuel pump of Bessiere can pump fuel out of delivery conduit 9.

None of the chambers of Bessiere are at all equivalent to a differential pressure chamber of a pressure amplifier, as recited in present claim 13. And none of the cited prior art could possibly lead one skilled in the art to consider modifying Bessiere to have such structure. Bessiere simply would have no use for a differential pressure chamber, since Bessiere's structure would not have any use for a pressure amplifier. And claim 13 clearly recites the differential pressure chamber, and further limits this differential pressure chamber to being part of a pressure amplifier. Since Bessiere has no use whatsoever for such structure, there is no reason under 35 USC 103 to add such structure to Bessiere.

While the reasoning behind the examiner's rejection is not easy to follow, the examiner is apparently reading claims 13 and 34 as if the language "controlling a pressure amplifier, and a control line....that leads to a valve that actuates the pressure amplifier" do not limit the claim to being in the environment of a pressure amplifier. Applicants do not agree with this interpretation.

Claims 13 and 34 are clearly limited to the connection point being in the differential pressure chamber of a pressure amplifier.

The examiner rejected claim 25 under 35 USC 102, explaining at the bottom of page 3 of the action, that somehow he is reading the extension 6a of chamber 6 as being as an encompassing groove in the cylindrical wall of the cylindrical chamber. This reading is clearly not warranted. Area 6a cannot be considered as anything other than an extension leading off from the bottom, flat wall of chamber 6. It is clearly not a pocket or encompassing groove in the cylindrical wall of the cylindrical chamber.

If the examiner insists on considering area 6a as being a modification of the cylindrical wall, while applicants clearly do not believe to be an appropriate interpretation of Bessiere, then the examiner must consider that such area 6a would in fact be a protrusion from the cylindrical wall, not a groove in it as recited in claim 25.

Thus claim 25, and the claims which depend on it, recite structure which Bessiere does not have so that a rejection under 35 USC 102 clearly is not appropriate.

Furthermore, there is no structure of record in any of the prior art which would lead one skilled in the art to consider placing Bessiere's pocket in a cylindrical wall of the chamber.

With regard to claim 33, the examiner has indicated that figure 1 of Bessiere indicates that the conduits 11 and 23 are of rectangular shape. The examiner's position on this point has no merit whatsoever. Contrary to the examiner's position, the cross section as shown in figure 1 of Bessiere does not indicate that conduits 11 and 23 are rectangular. The showing in figure 1 of Bessiere is appropriate for cylindrical bored conduits, as well as for rectangular conduits, plus the showing in Bessiere is appropriate for several other shapes for the conduits. The showing in the figures of Bessiere is generic to many shapes. And Bessiere includes no recitation in the specification as to what shape conduits 11 and 23 should be. In the absence of any

disclosure in this regard, it is not a fair reading for the examiner to assume that the conduits of Bessiere are rectangular. Certainly the showing in the drawings is not adequate for anyone to properly assume that they are rectangular.

As further evidence, it is requested that the examiner consider chamber 6, which Bessiere discloses as cylindrical. If the showing of chamber 6 is compared to the showing of conduits 11 and 23, the examiner will note that there is no difference other than the size of the cylinder. Most often conduits such as 11 and 23, which are formed in a more or less solid block of material, are formed by a boring process which makes cylindrical bores with circular openings. It would take an extraordinary effort to make the conduits 11 and 23 of Bessiere rectangular, and for the examiner to somehow assume that they are rectangular is simply not a fair reading and interpretation of Bessiere.

Clearly then, it is not proper for the examiner to have rejected claim 33 under 35 USC 102 with no teaching in Bessiere of the conduits being either oval or rectangular.

With regard to claims 24 and 36, the examiner's statement of rejection is clearly wrong. In the device of Bessiere only one bore, 23, leads into chamber 6a. Bore 11 leads into bore 23. Thus Bessiere has no teaching of at least two bores leading into the pocket or groove, and so a rejection under 35 USC 102 of these claims clearly is not proper.

For all of the above reasons, singly and in combination with each other, entry of this amendment and allowance of the claims are courteously solicited. Further, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any or all fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account 07-2100.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald E. Greigg
Registration No. 31,517
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 02119

GREIGG & GREIGG, P.L.L.C.
1423 Powhatan Street
Suite One
Alexandria, VA 22314

Tel. (703) 838-5500
Fax. (703) 838-5554

REG/SLS/ncr

J:\Bosch\R306015\Reply to Final 6-27-08 OA.wpd